

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOCK McNEELY,
Petitioner, Civ. S-00-1358 DFL PAN P
v.
LOU BLANAS,
Respondent. NON-RELATED CASE ORDER
_____/

DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-00-1508 WBS DAD
Plaintiff,
v.
SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.
Defendants.
_____/

DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-00-2797 DFL PAN P
Plaintiff,
v.
SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.
Defendants.
_____/

1 DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-01-2084 EJG GGH P

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.

4 ROY K. SIMMONS, et al.

5 Defendants.

6 /

7 DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-03-2172 DFL PAN

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 EDWARD BONNER, et al.

11 Defendants.

12 /

13 DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-04-0062 DFL PAN

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 LOU BLANAS, et al.

17 Defendants.

18 /

19 DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-04-1215 DFL PAN

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 EDWARD BONNER, et al.

23 Defendants.

24 /

1 DOCK McNEELY,

Civ. S-05-1401 MCE DAD

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.


4 SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.

5 Defendants.
6 _____/

7 A Notice of Related Cases was filed concerning the above-
8 captioned cases on September 27, 2005. See Local Rule 83-123
9 (E.D. Cal. 2005). On review of the cases, the court finds that
10 the cases ought not be related or reassigned. This order is
11 issued for informational purposes only, and shall have no effect
12 on the status of the cases, including any previous Related (or
13 Non-Related) Case Order of this court. Therefore, they shall not
14 be considered related.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: 10/20/2005

17
18 
19 _____

20 DAVID F. LEVI

21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26